



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,647	12/08/2003	Tsz Simon Cheng	BOC9-2003-0054 (425)	2979
40/987 7590 01/07/2009 AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188				
EXAMINER MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,647

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to RCE/Amendment filed on 10/30/2008.
2. Claims 1-3 and 8-11 are pending in this application. Claims 4-7 and 12-28 have been cancelled and claims 1-2 and 8 has been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al. ("O'Neill", US 6,219,653), Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,946), Fulton et al. ("Fulton", US 6,182,052), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Monteleone et al. ("Monteleone", US 7,184,973).

As per claim 1, O'Neill teaches a method for conducting business-to-business (B2) transactions comprising the steps of:

determining at least one e-commerce partner (col.5, lines 57-65);

determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner (col.16, lines 35-45) comprises at least one of the following steps, each step being based on a corresponding criterion:

detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period,

determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold,

determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size, and

determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 37-38; col.11, lines 45-53),

wherein the corresponding criteria for determining whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner are adjustable (col.16, lines 35-45);

presenting a partner identifier within a commerce graphical user interface for said e-commerce partner if it is determined that said e-commerce partner is an active partner (col.15, lines 42-64);

However, O'Neill does not teach presenting a partner identifier as an expandable node, when the partner node is expanded, presenting at least one transaction identifier and any transaction error as a child node of said expanded partner node, wherein each transaction identifier represents an e-commerce transaction between a user of the commerce graphical user interface and said e-commerce partner; categorizing a node associated with at least one of a transaction and an e-commerce partner; visually differentiating said node from other nodes at the same node level and at a different node level based upon a category of said node; and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable.

Janes teaches a method of displaying business transactions wherein partner identifiers are presented as expandable nodes presenting at least one transaction identifier as a child node wherein each identifier represents an e-commerce transaction between a user and an e-commerce partner; categorizing a node and visually differentiating said node from other nodes (Janes; Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 expanded presents transaction 901; Vendor 2 icon different from 901 icon*; col.9, lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include Janes' teaching with O'Neill's method in order to display transactions in an organized fashion.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill and Janes does not teach presenting any transaction error and differentiating nodes at the same node level and at different node level and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules, wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable. Fulton teaches a communications network for conducting transactions wherein transaction errors are displayed to the user (Fulton, col.5, lines 63-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Fulton's teaching with the method of O'Neill and Janes in order to notify the user of any errors.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill, Janes, and Fulton does not teach differentiating nodes at the same node level and at different node level and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules, wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable. Beaudet teaches a method of displaying differentiating nodes at the same and different levels (Beaudet, Fig.4, col.4, lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Beaudet's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, and Fulton in order to visualize the different transactions.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Fulton and Beaudet does not teach assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules, wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable. Monteleone teaches a method of processing transactions wherein responsible personnel are assigned to the particular transaction (Monteleone, col.8, lines 59-67para.0050). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Monteleone's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, Fulton and Beaudet in order to streamline issues to the appropriate expertise to handle the issue faster and more effectively.

As per claim 2, O'Neill teaches the method wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one trading partner (col.5, lines 57-65).

As per claim 3, O'Neill teaches the method further comprising the step of: providing a business partner gateway, wherein said commerce graphical user interface is an interface for interacting with said business partner gateway (col.15, lines 42-64).

As per claim 8, Fulton teaches the method further comprising the step of: detecting an electronic data interchange (EDI) transmission error; and indicating within said graphical user interface that an error occurred during an associated transmission (col.5, lines 63-67).

5. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al. ("O'Neill", US 6,219,653), Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,946), Fulton et al. ("Fulton", US 6,182,052), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Monteleone et al. ("Monteleone", US 7,184,973) in view of Stewart et al. ("Stewart", US 7,051,072).

As per claim 9, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Fulton, Beaudet, and Monteleone teaches the method comprising the step of receiving a selection specifying a node of said graphical user interface (Janes, col.9, lines 29-30). However, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Fulton, Beaudet, and Monteleone does not teach the step of responsively establishing a communication session between a user of said commerce graphical user interface and the e-commerce partner associated with said node. Stewart teaches a method of establishing real-time communication sessions between partners (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Stewart's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, Fulton Beaudet, and Monteleone in order to interact with partners in real-time.

As per claim 10, Stewart teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said communication session is an instant messaging session (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57).

As per claim 11, Stewart teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said establishing step further comprises the steps of: selecting a communication channel and establishing said communication session through said communication channel (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to Amendment filed 10/30/2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Communications

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4065. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174
/S. M./
/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178